rd/

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/092,458	03/07/2002	George G. Robertson	MS116623.2	1217

27195 7590 01/13/2005

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP
24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER
1900 EAST NINTH STREET
CLEVELAND, OH 44114

EXAMINER	
ROSWELL, MICHAEL	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2173	

DATE MAILED: 01/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/092,458	ROBERTSON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael Roswell	2173	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *07 March 2002*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-74* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-68 and 70-74* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *69* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *07 March 2002* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20020731 & 20020604
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claims 14, 40, and 70 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 14 contains the phrase "an import component operative import selected objects". Claim 40 contains "and/or", which fails to properly limit the claim. Claim 70 is missing a semi-colon after the first paragraph of the claim. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-31, 33-47, 49-68, and 70-74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kanevsky et al (US Patent 6,426,761), hereinafter Kanevsky.

Regarding claim 1, Kanevsky teaches a cluster indicator that represents a group of n objects visualized in an image space, where n is a natural number greater than or equal to 0 (taught as the use of a "central icon", around which other icons are displayed in close proximity, at col. 4, lines 16-22), and at least one graphical object dynamically visually associated with the group of objects based on a proximity of the at least one graphical object relative to the cluster

indicator (taught as the ability to relate an icon to a selected cluster through drag and drop methods, at col. 6, lines 22-37).

Regarding claim 2, Kanevsky teaches a plurality of clusters, each having a respective cluster indicator (taught as the "interrelated clusters of icons and sub-icons" of col. 3, lines 58-63, where the cluster indicators are the larger icons around which smaller icons are displayed. See Fig. 1(a).), membership of the at east one graphical object to one of the plurality of cluster being determined based on the proximity of the at least one graphical object respective to the respective cluster indicator of the one cluster (taught as the ability to relate an icon to a selected cluster through drag and drop methods, at col. 6, lines 22-37).

Regarding claim 3, Kanevsky teaches a clustering control that automatically associates the at least one graphical object with the one cluster, taught as the system detection of the need to add an icon to a cluster, at col. 6, lines 42-46.

Regarding claim 4, Kanevsky teaches the clustering control limiting automatic association of the at least one graphical object to when the at least one graphical object is within a threshold distance of the respective cluster indicator of the one cluster, taught as the initial drag and drop step for associating an icon with a cluster, at col. 6, lines 22-25.

Regarding claim 5, Kanevsky teaches implementing an embodiment of the invention on Microsoft Windows 95 and 98 operating systems. Inherently, Windows 95 and 98 teach the "auto-arrange" feature, in which dragging and dropping selected icons within a threshold

distance of another icon or icons results in the relocation of the non-selected icons to an area on the display sufficiently far away from the moved icons.

Regarding claim 6, the “auto-arrange” feature of Windows 95 and 98 allows for non-selected icons to stay in their first position if other icons are selectively dragged and dropped at a distance sufficiently far from the non-selected icons.

Regarding claim 7, Kanevsky teaches cluster indicators having different graphic elements to visually distinguish membership of the plurality of clusters, taught as the differing sizes of cluster indicators, as seen in Fig. 1(a).

Regarding claim 8, Kanevsky teaches the proximate location of sub icons to a central icon as the graphical element defining the cluster membership for displayed objects. See Fig. 1(a).

Regarding claim 9, as seen in Fig. 1(a), the larger central icon of Kanevsky is a banner used for easily identifying a fractal cluster.

Regarding claim 10, icons are inherently composed of graphical features. Furthermore, Kanevsky teaches audio related to displayed icons, at col. 10, lines 50-53.

Regarding claim 11, Kanevsky teaches representing clusters in a simulated three-dimensional image space, at col. 5, lines 13-18.

Regarding claim 12, Kanevsky teaches the use of annotations associated with a cluster indicator, taught as the use of fractal text arrangement, at col. 12, lines 16-19 and as shown in Fig. 5.

Regarding claim 13, Kanevsky teaches textual annotation (as shown *supra* at col. 12, lines 16-19 and as shown in Fig. 5) and audio annotation associated with audio data (shown as the audio characteristics of col. 10, lines 50-53).

Regarding claim 14, Kanevsky teaches implementing an embodiment of the invention on Microsoft Windows 95 and 98 operating systems. Inherently, Windows 95 and 98 teach the ability to drag and drop icons displayed in Windows Explorer onto the user's desktop. Thus, Kanevsky teaches an import component operative to import selected objects into the interface (user desktop), such that a graphical object associated with each respective imported object is visually represented in the image space.

Regarding claim 15, Kanevsky teaches a clustering component operative to visually associate imported objects with corresponding cluster indicators, taught as the ability to relate an icon to a selected cluster through drag and drop methods, at col. 6, lines 22-37.

Regarding claim 16, Kanevsky teaches a clustering component visually associating the graphical objects of imported objects with corresponding cluster indicators in the image space based on metadata of the imported objects, taught as the placement of an icon in the cluster hierarchy based on the size of information represented by an icon, at col. 4, lines 43-49.

Regarding claim 17, Kanevsky teaches a clustering component visually associating the graphical objects of imported objects with corresponding cluster indicators in the image space based on similarities between the imported objects, taught as the nesting determination of an icon based on parameters such as creating date, frequency of use, size of information represented by the icon, and relations between information represented by items such as icons or links, at col. 4, lines 43-49.

Regarding claim 18, Windows 95 and 98 are well known to teach the importing of objects from at least one of a data file and a storage medium from an external device, such as a floppy disk drive or CD-ROM drive.

Regarding claim 19, Kanevsky teaches a scaling component operative to scale a graphical object and a cluster indicator relative to the image space, taught as determining size scaling relationships between icons based on “association strengths”, at col. 8, lines 23-29.

Regarding claim 20, Kanevsky teaches changing the sizes of the displayed icons, without scaling the surface they are displayed on, taught as the scaling of icons based on inter-icon relationships, at col. 8, lines 23-29.

Regarding claim 21, Kanevsky teaches the scaling of icons independently (see col. 7, lines 25-28), and thus teaches scaling a graphical object in an amount proportionally different from the cluster indicator in response to a change in scaling.

Regarding claim 22, Kanevsky teaches a plurality of cluster indicators that represent different clusters, at least one of the plurality of cluster indicators comprising a cluster annotation, a plurality of the graphical objects visually associated with respective ones of the cluster indicators, the at least one graphical object being associated with the one of the plurality of cluster indicators such that the cluster annotation is associated with the at least one graphical object, taught as the fractal arrangement of annotations in a manner similar to the disclosed fractal icon arrangement, where the annotations are the displayed graphical objects, at col. 12, lines 16-23.

Regarding claims 23 and 24, Kanevsky teaches the use of drag and drop functionality to place textual annotations within a fractal cluster, at col. 12, lines 54-57.

Regarding claim 25, taken from page 39 of Applicant's specification, "The cluster data, for example, can include, data identifying the cluster, banner data so the object has the banner corresponding to the cluster and other data (e.g., audio, textual, video) that can help demonstrate membership of the object." Kanevsky teaches the graphical object having cluster data that varies according to with which of the plurality of cluster indicators the graphical objects is associated, taught as the differing fractal dimensions that display the cluster membership of displayed annotations, at col. 12, lines 19-23.

Regarding claim 26, Kanevsky teaches displaying at least a portion of cluster annotations of the cluster indicator with which the graphical object is associated. See Fig. 5.

Regarding claim 27, Kanevsky teaches allowing a user to annotate text to be added to a fractal text arrangement, at col. 11, lines 34-39.

Regarding claim 28, Windows 95 and 98 are well known to teach exporting graphical objects to external devices such as floppy disks, as well as functionality like cut and paste, that would allow the exportation of a graphical object from a user's desktop to an application program or a data file. Windows 95 and 98 are also well known to provide means for uploading files and objects to websites.

Regarding claim 28, Kanevsky teaches implementing an embodiment of the invention on Microsoft Windows 95 and 98 operating systems. Inherently, Windows 95 and 98 teach the ability to drag and drop icons displayed on the user desktop into a folder displayed on the desktop or an open window. Thus, Kanevsky teaches an export component operative to export selected objects from the interface (user desktop) to a desired destination.

Regarding claim 30, Windows 95 and 98 are well known to support the exporting of multiple selected graphical objects, such as a large number of icons or displayed objects, from the user desktop to a desired destination.

Regarding claim 31, it is well known in the art that Windows 95 and 98 support the display of two-dimensional icons on a user desktop.

Regarding claim 33, Kanevsky teaches a cluster indicator that represents a group of n objects visualized in an image space, where n is a natural number greater than or equal to 0

(taught as the use of a "central icon", around which other icons are displayed in close proximity, at col. 4, lines 16-22), and at least one graphical object dynamically visually associated with the group of objects based on a proximity of the at least one graphical object relative to the cluster indicator (taught as the ability to relate an icon to a selected cluster through drag and drop methods, at col. 6, lines 22-37). Kanevsky further teaches a scaling component operative to selectively scale a graphical object and a cluster indicator independently of the image space, at col. 7, lines 25-28.

Regarding claim 34, Kanevsky teaches representing clusters in a simulated three-dimensional image space, at col. 5, lines 13-18, and scaling a graphical object and a cluster indicator independently of the image space, at col. 7, lines 25-28.

Regarding claim 35, Kanevsky teaches the scaling of icons independently (see col. 7, lines 25-28), and thus teaches scaling a graphical object in an amount proportionally different from the cluster indicator in response to a change in scaling.

Regarding claims 36 and 37, Kanevsky teaches a clustering control that automatically associates the at least one graphical object with the one cluster, taught as the system detection of the need to add an icon to a cluster, at col. 6, lines 42-46.

Regarding claim 38, Kanevsky teaches a clustering control that automatically associates the at least one graphical object with the one cluster, taught as the system detection of the need to add an icon to a cluster, at col. 6, lines 42-46.

Regarding claim 39, Kanevsky teaches the clustering control limiting automatic association of the at least one graphical object to when the at least one graphical object is within a threshold distance of the respective cluster indicator of the one cluster, taught as the initial drag and drop step for associating an icon with a cluster, at col. 6, lines 22-25.

Regarding claim 40, Kanevsky teaches a cluster indicator that represents a group of n objects visualized in an image space, where n is a natural number greater than or equal to 0 (taught as the use of a "central icon", around which other icons are displayed in close proximity, at col. 4, lines 16-22), and at least one graphical object visually associated with the group of objects based on a proximity of the at least one graphical object relative to the cluster indicator (taught as the ability to relate an icon to a selected cluster through drag and drop methods, at col. 6, lines 22-37). Kanevsky further teaches the graphical object having cluster data that varies according to with which of the plurality of cluster indicators the graphical objects is associated, taught as the differing fractal dimensions that display the cluster membership of displayed annotations, at col. 12, lines 19-23.

Regarding claim 41, Kanevsky teaches a graphical object having a plurality of operating states (such as selected or not selected), wherein the graphical object is capable of moving relative to the image space in response to manipulation of the at least one graphical object with the pointer, taught as the ability to relate an icon to a selected cluster through drag and drop methods, at col. 6, lines 22-37.

Regarding claim 42, Kanevsky teaches the clustering control dynamically associating the at least one graphical object to a cluster indicator when the at least one graphical object is

within a threshold distance of the respective cluster indicator of the one cluster, taught as the initial drag and drop step for associating an icon with a cluster, at col. 6, lines 22-25.

Regarding claim 43, taken from page 39 of Applicant's specification, "The cluster data, for example, can include, data identifying the cluster, banner data so the object has the banner corresponding to the cluster and other data (e.g., audio, textual, video) that can help demonstrate membership of the object." Kanevsky teaches the graphical object having cluster data that varies according to with which of the plurality of cluster indicators the graphical objects is associated, taught as the differing fractal dimensions that display the cluster membership of displayed annotations, at col. 12, lines 19-23.

Regarding claim 44, Kanevsky teaches allowing a user to annotate text to be added to a fractal text arrangement, at col. 11, lines 34-39.

Regarding claim 45, Kanevsky teaches annotations that may be sized or moved around a fractal cluster of annotations based on several parameters (see col. 11, lines 59-63)or by manual placement (see col. 12, lines 54-57), and therefore holds no association to any specific cluster indicator.

Regarding claim 46, Kanevsky teaches the graphical object having cluster data that varies according to with which of the plurality of cluster indicators the graphical objects is associated, taught as the differing fractal dimensions that display the cluster membership of displayed annotations, at col. 12, lines 19-23.

Regarding claim 47, Kanevsky teaches the proximate location of sub icons to a central icon as the graphical element defining the cluster membership for displayed objects. See Fig. 1(a).

Regarding claim 49, inherently, Kanevsky teaches a cluster data structure comprising a cluster indicator field for storing location information for a cluster indicator that graphically represents a cluster (as location parameters must be stored by the operating system for the display of the central icons), and a second cluster field that stores information to facilitate identifying a cluster (parameters used to facilitate cluster identification may include the color and size of the central icon or sub icons. Such identifying features are taught at col. 10, lines 43-50). Furthermore, Kanevsky must inherently teach an object data structure comprising a location field that stores location information for a graphical representation of an object (as location parameters must be stored by the operating system for the display of the icons), and a cluster field that stores association information indicating an association between the object data structure and the at least one cluster, the association information being determined as a function of the location information for the object relative to the location information for the cluster (as an entire cluster may be moved as a unit, shown at col. 10, lines 53-55, the icons being initially associated with a cluster through drag and drop methods, at col. 6, lines 22-37).

Regarding claim 50, Kanevsky teaches the second cluster field comprising at least one of a title and an annotation field that contains the information to facilitate identifying the at least one cluster, the cluster field of the object data structure further comprising an annotation field that stores information derived from the information contained in the at least one of a title and an

annotation field, taught inherently as the storing of the annotation information of col. 12, lines 19-23.

Regarding claim 51, inherently, any change in the annotations would result in a change in the annotation field of the object data structure.

Regarding claim 52, Kanevsky teaches an object data structure further comprising an image field that stores graphical data associated with an object, including the graphical representation of the object, taught inherently as the storing of the icon related to the displayed object.

Regarding claim 53, Kanevsky teaches a cluster indicator that represents a group of n objects visualized in an image space, where n is a natural number greater than or equal to 0 (taught as the use of a "central icon", around which other icons are displayed in close proximity, at col. 4, lines 16-22), and at least one graphical object dynamically visually associated with the group of objects based on a proximity of the at least one graphical object relative to the cluster indicator (taught as the ability to relate an icon to a selected cluster through drag and drop methods, at col. 6, lines 22-37).

Regarding claim 54, Kanevsky teaches a clustering control that automatically associates the at least one graphical object with the one cluster, taught as the system detection of the need to add an icon to a cluster, at col. 6, lines 42-46.

Regarding claim 55, Kanevsky teaches implementing an embodiment of the invention on Microsoft Windows 95 and 98 operating systems. Inherently, Windows 95 and 98 teach the "auto-arrange" feature, in which dragging and dropping selected icons within a threshold distance of another icon or icons results in the relocation of the non-selected icons to an area on the display sufficiently far away from the moved icons.

Regarding claim 56, Kanevsky teaches a scaling component operative to scale a graphical object and a cluster indicator relative to the image space, taught as determining size scaling relationships between icons based on "association strengths", at col. 8, lines 23-29.

Regarding claim 57, Kanevsky teaches the scaling of icons independently (see col. 7, lines 25-28), and thus teaches scaling a graphical object in an amount proportionally different from the cluster indicator in response to a change in scaling.

Regarding claim 58, Kanevsky teaches a cluster indicator that represents a group of n objects visualized in an image space, where n is a natural number greater than or equal to 0 (taught as the use of a "central icon", around which other icons are displayed in close proximity, at col. 4, lines 16-22), and at least one graphical object dynamically visually associated with the group of objects based on a proximity of the at least one graphical object relative to the cluster indicator (taught as the ability to relate an icon to a selected cluster through drag and drop methods, at col. 6, lines 22-37).

Regarding claim 59, Kanevsky teaches a plurality of clusters, each having a respective cluster indicator (taught as the "interrelated clusters of icons and sub-icons" of col. 3, lines 58-

63, where the cluster indicators are the larger icons around which smaller icons are displayed. See Fig. 1(a).), membership of the at east one graphical object to one of the plurality of cluster being determined based on the proximity of the at least one graphical object respective to the respective cluster indicator of the one cluster (taught as the ability to relate an icon to a selected cluster through drag and drop methods, at col. 6, lines 22-37).

Regarding claim 60, Kanevsky teaches a clustering control that automatically associates the at least one graphical object with the one cluster, taught as the system detection of the need to add an icon to a cluster, at col. 6, lines 42-46.

Regarding claim 61, Kanevsky teaches implementing an embodiment of the invention on Microsoft Windows 95 and 98 operating systems. Inherently, Windows 95 and 98 teach the "auto-arrange" feature, in which dragging and dropping selected icons within a threshold distance of another icon or icons results in the relocation of the non-selected icons to an area on the display sufficiently far away from the moved icons.

Regarding claim 62, Kanevsky teaches the proximate location of sub icons to a central icon as the graphical element defining the cluster membership for displayed objects. See Fig. 1(a).

Regarding claim 63, Kanevsky teaches representing clusters in a simulated three-dimensional image space, at col. 5, lines 13-18.

Regarding claim 64, Kanevsky teaches a plurality of cluster indicators that represent different clusters, at least one of the plurality of cluster indicators comprising a cluster annotation, a plurality of the graphical objects visually associated with respective ones of the cluster indicators, the at least one graphical object being associated with the one of the plurality of cluster indicators such that the cluster annotation is associated with the at least one graphical object, taught as the fractal arrangement of annotations in a manner similar to the disclosed fractal icon arrangement, where the annotations are the displayed graphical objects, at col. 12, lines 16-23.

Regarding claim 65, Kanevsky teaches implementing an embodiment of the invention on Microsoft Windows 95 and 98 operating systems. Inherently, Windows 95 and 98 teach the ability to drag and drop icons displayed in Windows Explorer onto the user's desktop. Thus, Kanevsky teaches an import component operative to import selected objects into the interface (user desktop), such that a graphical object associated with each respective imported object is visually represented in the image space.

Regarding claims 66 and 67, Kanevsky teaches a scaling component operative to scale a graphical object and a cluster indicator relative to the image space, taught as determining size scaling relationships between icons based on "association strengths", at col. 8, lines 23-29.

Regarding claim 68, Kanevsky teaches the scaling of icons independently (see col. 7, lines 25-28), and thus teaches scaling a graphical object in an amount proportionally different from the cluster indicator in response to a change in scaling.

Regarding claim 70, Kanevsky teaches selecting a graphical object, moving the selected graphical object in the image space, and dynamically associating the moving graphical object with another of the plurality of cluster indicators in response to the moving graphical object being moved to a position that is closer to the another cluster indicator than to that at least one cluster indicator, taught as the ability to relate an icon to a selected cluster through drag and drop methods, at col. 6, lines 22-37.

Regarding claim 71, Kanevsky teaches modifying cluster data of an at least one graphical object to reflect a change in cluster membership based on the dynamic association with the another cluster, as an entire cluster may be moved as a unit, shown at col. 10, lines 53-55, the icons being initially associated with a cluster through drag and drop methods, at col. 6, lines 22-37.

Regarding claims 72 and 73, Windows 95 and 98 are well known to support the exporting of multiple selected graphical objects, such as a large number of icons or displayed objects, from the user desktop to a desired destination.

Regarding claim 74, Kanevsky teaches a cluster indicator that represents a group of n objects visualized in an image space, where n is a natural number greater than or equal to 0 (taught as the use of a "central icon", around which other icons are displayed in close proximity, at col. 4, lines 16-22), and at least one graphical object dynamically visually associated with the group of objects based on a proximity of the at least one graphical object relative to the cluster indicator (taught as the ability to relate an icon to a selected cluster through drag and drop methods, at col. 6, lines 22-37).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 32 and 48 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanevsky.

Regarding claim 32, while Kanevsky does not explicitly teach displaying a two-dimensional image as a graphical representation of a photograph, thumbnails comprising low-resolution snapshots of digital photographs are well known in the art, and are often used in the Windows Operating System. The Examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE of these teachings. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include thumbnails of graphical files on the desktop in place of an ordinary icon, for the obvious advantage of an easily seen preview of the graphical file.

Regarding claim 48, while Kanevsky does not explicitly teach color-coding displayed banners, techniques such as color-coding are notoriously well known in many visual arts. The Examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE of these teachings. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to color-code inter-related icons, as color-coding is useful for displaying relationships between objects, just as Kanevsky displays the relationship between objects by their spatial relations.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 69 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The claim recites limitations directed to an at least one graphical object inheriting at least a portion of an annotation from an at least one cluster indicator. This feature is not disclosed in the cited prior art.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The cited prior art relates to user interfaces that utilize clustering, and the state of the art in general.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Roswell whose telephone number is (571) 272-4055. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 - 6:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached on (571) 272-4048. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Michael Roswell
1/5/2004

JOHN CABECA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100